

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed January 6, 2005, the Examiner has rejected all of the pending claims 1-14. New claim 15 has been added. Thus, claims 1-15 are pending and under consideration. No new matter has been added. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 and 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Weinberg. Weinberg is directed to a computer-implemented method for facilitating generation of an automated test for testing functionality of a transactional server. The method employs a testing tool that records a series of user steps executed during a user session with a server. See Weinberg, column 22, lines 55-56.

The present invention is directed to test assisting for testing operation of a server computer which provides services using a structured document which can be browsed by a document browsing device. The test assisting program includes a test assisting device which receives a structured document from a server computer and acquires attribute information of a data input area of the document. Based on the attribute information of the data input area, the test assisting device generates candidate data for data to be inputted into the data input area. See Specification, page 8, line 21 – page 9, line 1. As a result, data to be inputted into the data input area can be selected from the candidate data when the server is tested. Thus, errors which may occur by inputting data into the data input area are reduced or eliminated, and reliability of the testing is increased. See Specification, page 9, line 26 – page 10, line 7.

This feature of the present invention is recited in independent claim 1, for example, as “generating candidate data for data to be inputted into the data input area based on the attribute information of the data input area.” Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, 11 and 13 are not anticipated by Weinberg, as Weinberg does not teach each and every element of the claims. More specifically, Weinberg does not teach the element identified by the above-quoted language of independent claim 1, for example.

The section of Weinberg cited by the Examiner indicates that a *testscript* is generated during the recording session, not candidate data for data to be inputted into a data input area based on attribute information, as in the present invention. This section of Weinberg also indicates that nodes of a tree that represent a user session can also be generated and can include an object identifier and data to be entered. But Weinberg does not indicate that the *data*

within the nodes is generated. In fact, Weinberg indicates that the nodes of the tree are nothing more than representations of the user session, for example, a business process. See Weinberg, column 9, lines 21-24 and column 21, lines 35-36. The *data* to be entered within the nodes is merely the same data entered by a user during the user session. See Weinberg, column 21, lines 22-29. Thus, the *data* within the nodes is not generated. Rather, the nodes, which are merely representations of the steps of the user session, are generated.

Therefore, claims 1, 9, 11 and 13 (claims 9, 11 and 13 recite language similar to that of claim 1) are patentable over Weinberg, as Weinberg does not teach, "generating candidate data for data to be inputted into the data input area based on the attribute information of the data input area."

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is also patentable over Weinberg for at least the reason offered above, in addition to other reasons. For example, claim 2 recites, "wherein the step of generating the candidate data comprises a step of generating data matching the attribute information and data not matching the attribute information." Applicant submits that claim 2 is patentable over Weinberg, as Weinberg does not disclose information pertaining to generating data matching the attribute information and data not matching the attribute information. In fact, as previously stated, Weinberg merely discloses generating nodes, not data pertaining to attribute information.

Regarding independent claims 3, 10, 12 and 14, claim 14, for example, recites, in relevant part, "determining details of an operation input for requesting the server computer to carry out a process when the operation input is applied to the document browsing device." It is respectfully submitted that Weinberg does not teach the feature of the claims identified by the quoted language. The section of Weinberg cited by the Examiner in the rejection (columns 9-10) refers to the submission of a data form or type (e.g., a link type) to a website. Merely submitting a data form is not tantamount and does not suggest determining details of an operation input, as recited in the language of the above-identified claims.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 3, 10, 12 and 14 are patentable over Weinberg, for the reason offered above. As claim 4 depends from claim 3, it is patentable over Weinberg for at least the reason offered with respect to claim 3.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Weinberg. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 3, from which claims 5 and 6 depend is patentable over Weinberg, as Weinberg does not teach or suggest “determining details of an operation input for requesting the server computer to carry out a process when the operation input is applied to the document browsing device.” Therefore, claims 5 and 6 are patentable over Weinberg for at least the reason offered above with respect to independent claim 3.

The Examiner has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,446,120 B1, issued to Dantressangle (hereinafter Dantressangle). As previously discussed, Applicant submits that Weinberg does not teach or suggest “determining details of an operation input for requesting the server computer to carry out a process when the operation input is applied to the document browsing device,” as recited by claim 3, from which claim 7 depends.

Likewise, Applicant submits that Dantressangle does not teach or suggest, “determining details of an operation input for requesting the server computer to carry out a process when the operation input is applied to the document browsing device,” as recited by claim 3. Rather, Dantressangle merely discloses that commands are transmitted from a browser computer to a server computer. No information is provided regarding determining details of an operation input, as recited in claim 7 via claim 3. See Dantressangle, column 1, lines 52-55. Therefore, claim 7 is patentable over Weinberg in view of Dantressangle, as neither Weinberg nor Dantressangle, taken alone, or in combination, teaches or suggests the feature of claim 7 via claim 3 identified by the above-quoted language.

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weinberg in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 20030043185 A1, issued to Kake *et al.* (hereinafter Kake). Applicant submits that Weinberg does not teach the feature identified by the above-quoted language, as recited by claim 3, from which claim 8 depends. In addition, Applicant respectfully wishes to bring to the Examiner's attention an apparent oversight in citing the reference Kake. In particular, Applicant submits that Kake is not prior art that can be applied to Applicant's patent application. The priority date of Applicant's patent application is August 2, 2001. As the filing date of Kake is June 21, 2002, it cannot be considered prior art, as June 21, 2002 is later in time than August 2, 2001. Moreover, Applicant submits that the filing date of

Kake is also after the filing date of Applicant's patent application, which was filed on February 27, 2002. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection in view of Kake be withdrawn, as Kake is not prior art.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 9, 11 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Muraishi. Although the inventive entity of the publication is different than that of Applicant's patent application, the Applicant is one of the authors of the publication. Applicant submits that the disclosure in the reference is Applicant's own work. Although Applicant is not submitting a declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 herewith at this time, Applicant reserves the right to do so at a later time.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 2, 9, 11 and 13 are patentable over Muraishi, as Muraishi does not teach each and every element of the claims. In particular, Muraishi does not teach, "generating candidate data for data to be inputted into the data input area based on the attribute information of the data input area," as recited in claim 1, for example.

Rather, according to Muraishi, it teaches generation of an input data file. But the input data file is not based on attribute information of a data input area. As admitted by the Examiner, Muraishi clearly states that the input data file is based on screen definition information. Applicant respectfully submits that the screen definition information is not attribute information of a data input area, as recited in the claims of the present invention. See Muraishi, page 3, paragraph [0060]. See *also* Specification of the Present Invention, page 8, lines 21-25. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, 11 and 13 are patentable over the reference. Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1 and is thus patentable over the reference for at least the reason offered above with respect to claim 1.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 7, 10, 12 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muraishi. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 is patentable over Muraishi, as Muraishi does not teach the feature identified in Applicant's argument with respect to Weinberg.

Therefore, claims 3, 10, 12 and 14 are patentable over Muraishi, as Muraishi does not teach or suggest the feature identified by the above-quoted language of claims 3, 10, 12 and 14. As claim 7 depends from claim 3, it is patentable over the reference for at least the reason offered above with respect to claim 3.

Serial No. 10/083,489

Regarding new claim 15, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 is patentable over the references, as the references do not teach or suggest its features.

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103, as none of the claims are taught, disclosed or suggested by the references. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.


Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

6 May 05

By:


Reginald D. Lucas
Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501